

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-3, 7, 9-15, 18-22 and 24-33 are now pending in this application. In the January 28, 2009 Office Action, Claims 1-3, 12-17, 22-28, and 32-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Burnett*, U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0087408 (hereinafter “*Burnett*”). Claims 7, 9-11, 18-21, and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Burnett* in view of Lawrence, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,738,780, (hereinafter “*Lawrence*”).

By this amendment, claims 1, 13, and 24 have been amended. Following entry of this amendment, claims 1-3, 7, 9-15, 18-22 and 24-33 will be pending in the present application. For the reasons set forth below, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and immediate allowance of this application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 12-17, 22-28, and 32-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Burnett*. The Applicant respectfully submits that *Burnett* does not teach, suggest, or describe each and every recitation of these claims.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “searching a database for a match between user input regarding a problem and information in the database” and “obtaining at least one keyword from the information in the database resulting from searching the database for the problem.” *Burnett* at [0015] discloses that search engines accept “keywords” from a user and turns a list of websites containing these keywords. However, *Burnett* does not teach or suggest “user input regarding a problem” or matching the user input regarding the problem to “information in the database.” Further, *Burnett* does not teach or suggest “obtaining at least one keyword from the information in the database resulting from searching the database for the problem,” as recited in claim 1.

It should also be noted that the “keyword” described in *Burnett* is distinguishable from the claimed “keyword.” In particular, the “keyword” in *Burnett* is entered by the user into the search engine, whereas the claimed “keyword” is retrieved from the “information in the database resulting from searching the database for the problem.” In particular, because the “keyword” in

Burnett is entered by the user, it follows that the “keyword” is not retrieved from the “information in the database resulting from searching the database for the problem,” as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 further recites, *inter alia*, “the technical relevance comprising a utility of the at least one offered service to resolve the problem, the provider preference comprising a preference of a service provider to sell the at least one offered service.” *Burnett* does not teach or suggest “the technical relevance comprising a utility of the at least one offered service to resolve the problem” or “the provider preference comprising a preference of a service provider to sell the at least one offered service.” In view of these claimed features, it follows that *Burnett* does not teach or suggest “the at least one offered service associated with a technical weighting indicating a technical relevance of the at least one offered service and a preference weighting indicating a provider preference of the at least one offered service,” as recited claim 1.

Accordingly, *Burnett* does not teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of independent claim 1. The Applicant further submits that claims 2-3, 7, and 9-12 are also patentable because they contain recitations not taught by *Burnett* and because these claims depend from an allowable independent claim. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-3, 7, and 9-12 are in condition for immediate allowance.

Claim 13

Claim 13 recites, *inter alia*, “logic configured to search a database for a match between user input regarding a computer-related problem and information in the database” and “logic configured to obtain at least one keyword from the information in the database resulting from searching the database for the computer-related problem.” *Burnett* at [0015] discloses that search engines accept “keywords” from a user and turns a list of websites containing these keywords. However, *Burnett* does not teach or suggest “user input regarding a problem” or matching the user input regarding the problem to “information in the database.” Further, *Burnett* does not teach or suggest “logic configured to obtain at least one keyword from the information in the database resulting from searching the database for the computer-related problem,” as recited in claim 13.

Claim 13 further recites, *inter alia*, “the technical relevance comprising a utility of the at least one offered service to resolve the computer-related problem, the provider preference

comprising a preference of a service provider to sell the at least one offered service.” *Burnett* does not teach or suggest “the technical relevance comprising a utility of the at least one offered service to resolve the computer-related problem” or “the provider preference comprising a preference of a service provider to sell the at least one offered service.” In view of these claimed features, it follows that *Burnett* does not teach or suggest “the at least one offered service associated with a technical weighting indicating a technical relevance of the at least one offered service and a preference weighting indicating a provider preference of the at least one offered service,” as recited in claim 13.

Accordingly, *Burnett* does not teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of independent claim 13. The Applicant further submits that claims 14-15 and 18-22 are also patentable because they contain recitations not taught by *Burnett* and because these claims depend from an allowable independent claim. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 14-15 and 18-22 are in condition for immediate allowance.

Claim 24

Claim 24 recites, *inter alia*, “a cyler configured to search through a database to match user input regarding a computer-related security problem with sales information in the database and to provide at least one database-provided keyword from the information in the database resulting from searching the database for the computer-related security problem.” *Burnett* at [0015] discloses that search engines accept “keywords” from a user and turns a list of websites containing these keywords. However, *Burnett* does not teach or suggest “user input regarding a computer-related security problem” or matching the user input regarding the computer-related security problem to “information in the database.” Further, *Burnett* does not teach or suggest “a cyler configured to ... provide at least one database-provided keyword from the information in the database resulting from searching the database for the computer-related security,” as recited in claim 24. In particular, the “keyword” in *Burnett* is provided by not user, not retrieved from the database.

Claim 24 further recites, *inter alia*, “the technical relevance comprising a utility of the at least one offered service to resolve the computer-related security problem, the provider preference comprising a preference of a service provider to sell the at least one offered service.” *Burnett* does not teach or suggest “the technical relevance comprising a utility of the at least one

offered service to resolve the computer-related security problem” or “the provider preference comprising a preference of a service provider to sell the at least one offered service.” In view of these claimed features, it follows that *Burnett* does not teach or suggest “the at least one offered service associated with a technical weighting indicating a technical relevance of the at least one offered service and a preference weighting indicating a provider preference of the at least one offered service,” as recited in claim 24.

Accordingly, *Burnett* does not teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of independent claim 24. The Applicant further submits that claims 25-33 are also patentable because they contain recitations not taught by *Burnett* and because these claims depend from an allowable independent claim. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 25-33 are in condition for immediate allowance.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

In the Office Action, claims 7, 9-11, 18-21, and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Burnett* in view of *Lawrence*. *Lawrence* does not cure the above-identified deficiencies of *Burnett*. In particular, *Lawrence*, like *Burnett*, discusses inputting user-provided keywords into a search interface to generate search results: “a query processing module 16 which supports search by keyword and browsing by citation links through a web browser interface 18 to the world wide web.” (*Lawrence* at col. 7, lines 35-38). The “keyword” of *Lawrence* is not retrieved from the “information in the database resulting from searching the database for the problem,” as recited in claim 1. Further, *Lawrence* also does not disclose “user input regarding a problem,” also as recited in claim 1.

For at least the reasons provided above with respect to claims 1, 13, and 24 and since *Lawrence* does not cure the above-identified deficiencies of *Burnett*, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7, 9-11, 18-21, and 29-31 are allowable over the combined teaching of *Burnett* and *Lawrence*.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims in the present application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application and allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney at (404) 815-1900.

Respectfully submitted,

HOPE BALDAUFF HARTMAN, LLC

/Steven Koon Hon Wong/

Date: May 28, 2009

"Steven" Koon Hon Wong
Reg. No. 48,459

AT&T Legal Department
Attn: Patent Docketing
One AT&T Way
Room 2A-207
Bedminster, New Jersey 07921

